

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND DIVISION

Verletta McCutchen, individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:21cv50

-v.-

I.C System, Inc.
and John Does 1-25

Defendants.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff Verletta McCutchen (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), a Virginia resident, brings this Class Action Complaint by and through her attorneys, Meridian Law, LLC, against Defendant I.C. System, Inc. (hereinafter "Defendant ICS"), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff's counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff's personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Congress enacted the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("The FDCPA" or "The Act") in 1977 in response to the "abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors." 15 U.S.C. §1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that "abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal

bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." *Id.* Congress concluded that "existing laws...[we]re inadequate to protect consumers," and that "'the effective collection of debts" does not require "misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices." 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).

2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to "insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged." *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate. *Id.* § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et. seq. The Court has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a).

4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) as this is where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred and where the plaintiff resides.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of Virginia consumers under § 1692 et seq. of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act ("FDCPA"), and

6. Plaintiff is seeking damages and declaratory relief.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of Virginia, City of Chesterfield, residing at 4908 Burnt Oak Dr., Apt. 103, Richmond, VA 23234.

8. Defendant ICS is a "debt collector" as the phrase is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6) and used in the FDCPA with an address at 240 Emery Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015 and an address for service in c/o C T Corporation System, 4701 Cox Road, Suite 285, Glenn Allen, VA 23060.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant ICS is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.

10. John Does 1-25, are fictitious names of individuals and businesses alleged for the purpose of substituting names of Defendants whose identities will be disclosed in discovery and should be made parties to this action.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

11. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of the following case, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3).

12. The Class consists of:

- a. all individuals with addresses in the State of Virginia;
- b. to whom Defendant ICS sent a collection letter attempting to collect a consumer debt;
- c. that stated that the debt would be reported to the credit bureaus in the creditor's name;
- d. which letter was sent on or after a date one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and on or before a date twenty-one (21) days after the filing of this action.

13. The identities of all class members are readily ascertainable from the records of Defendants and those companies and entities on whose behalf they attempt to collect and/or have purchased debts.

14. Excluded from the Plaintiff Class are the Defendants and all officer, members, partners, managers, directors and employees of the Defendants and their respective immediate families, and legal counsel for all parties to this action, and all members of their immediate families.

15. There are questions of law and fact common to the Plaintiff Class, which common issues predominate over any issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendants' written communications to consumers, in the forms attached as Exhibit A, violate 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e.

16. The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the class members, as all are based upon the same facts and legal theories. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff Class defined in this complaint. The Plaintiff has retained counsel with experience in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions, and neither the Plaintiff nor her attorneys have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

17. This action has been brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community interest in the litigation:

- a. **Numerosity:** The Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the Plaintiff Class defined above is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical.

- b. **Common Questions Predominate:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff Class and those questions predominate over any questions or issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendants' written communications to consumers, in the forms attached as Exhibit A violate 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- c. **Typicality:** The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. The Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff Class have claims arising out of the Defendants' common uniform course of conduct complained of herein.
- d. **Adequacy:** The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class members insofar as Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to the absent class members. The Plaintiff is committed to vigorously litigating this matter. Plaintiff has also retained counsel experienced in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions. Neither the Plaintiff nor her counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue the instant class action lawsuit.
- e. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to the other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that individual actions would engender.

18. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that the questions of law and fact common to members of the Plaintiff

Class predominate over any questions affecting an individual member, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

19. Depending on the outcome of further investigation and discovery, Plaintiff may, at the time of class certification motion, seek to certify a class(es) only as to particular issues pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.

21. Some time prior to February 24, 2020, an obligation was allegedly incurred to creditor PSEG-NJ.

22. The PSEG-NJ obligation arose out of transactions incurred primarily for personal, family or household purposes.

23. The alleged PSEG-NJ obligation is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

24. PSEG-NJ is a "creditor" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(4).

25. Defendant ICS contracted with PSEG-NJ to collect the alleged debt.

Violation – February 24, 2020 Collection Letter

26. On or about February 24, 2020, Defendant ICS sent the Plaintiff an initial collection letter (the "Letter") regarding the alleged debt owed. See a true and correct copy of the Letter attached at Exhibit A.

27. The letter states:

"PSEG-NJ has referred your past due account to I.C. System to pursue collections. PSEG-NJ is both the original and current creditor to whom this debt is owed. As of the date of this letter our records show the account balance remains unpaid....

The account information is scheduled to be reported to the national credit reporting agencies in your creditor's name. You have the right to inspect your credit file in accordance with federal law. I.C System will not submit the account information to the national credit reporting agencies until the expiration of the time period described in the notice below."

28. The letter states that the account information is scheduled to be reported in "your creditor's name," which according to the Letter is PSEG-NJ.

29. However, upon information and belief, Defendant ICS reports the debt in their own name to the national credit reporting agencies. Therefore, the letter is deceptive by stating that the account will be reported in the name of the original creditor.

30. In addition, the letter states "I.C. System" will not submit the account information until the expiration of the time period described below, implying that after said "expiration of the time period," Defendant ICS would be doing the credit reporting.

31. In the alternative, if both Defendant ICS and the original creditor are both reporting to the national reporting agencies, it would constitute deceptive double-reporting.

32. It is deceptive for two companies will report to the credit reporting agencies on the same debt.

33. As a result of Defendant's deceptive, misleading and unfair debt collection practices, Plaintiff has been damaged.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §1692e *et seq.*

34. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.

35. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

36. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

37. Defendant violated § 1692e:

- a. As the Letter it is open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.
- b. By making a false and misleading representation in violation of §1692e(10).

38. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692e et seq. of the FDCPA, and Plaintiff is entitled to an award of actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

39. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Verletta McCutchen, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated demands judgment from Defendant ICS as follows:

1. Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Aryeh Stein as Class Counsel;
2. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
3. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;

4. Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
5. Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
6. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: January 28, 2021

Meridian Law, LLC

/s/ Aryeh E. Stein

By: Aryeh E. Stein, VSB 45895
600 Reisterstown Road
Suite 700
Baltimore, MD 21208
Phone: 443-326-6011
Fax: 410-653-9061
astein@meridianlawfirm.com

STEIN SAKS, PLLC

/s/ Raphael Deutsch

Raphael Deutsch, Esq.
285 Passaic Street
Hackensack, NJ 07601
Telephone: 201-282-6500
Fax: 201-282-6501
rdeutsch@steinsakslegal.com
*Lead Attorneys for Plaintiff
Pro Hac Vice to be filed*